REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 9, 2005. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 14, 27, and 28 are in independent form. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 11-14, 16-19, and 21-28 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Information Disclosure Statements and corresponding PTO-1449 forms were submitted on March 21, 2003, June 17, 2005, and June 20, 2005, as evidenced by the receipt postcards each bearing the stamp of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Copies of the receipt postcards are attached hereto. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to return initialed copies of the PTO-1449 forms for the three Information Disclosure Statements, indicating that the references listed thereon have been considered and made of record in the present application.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0107356 (Shamoon et al.).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 28, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from Shamoon et al. for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus for demultiplexing and decoding a bitstream, which contains a plurality of object data and management information for managing each of the plurality of object data, and for reproducing the plurality of object data.

The apparatus includes extraction means and control means. The extraction means extracts, from the management information, time limit information pertaining to a time

limit set for each of the plurality of object data. The time limit information includes information of a period in which reproduction is permitted. The control means controls a reproduction process set for each of the plurality of object data based on the time limit information.

One of the notable features of Claim 1 is that it addresses the problem of how to set a time limit for each object of a plurality of objects included in a bitstream, in order to prevent excess use of any or all of the plurality of objects. The apparatus of Claim 1 solves this problem by extracting time limit information from the bitstream. The time limit information pertains to a time limit set for each of the plurality of objects, and includes information on when reproduction is permitted. That is, the reproduction process of each of the plurality of objects is controlled based on the extracted time limit information. Thus, by virtue of this feature of Claim 1, it is possible to prevent excess use of an object through the time limit set for the object, which is included in the time limit information extracted from management information included in the bitstream.

Shamoon et al. relates to a system for protecting streamed media through the use of different decryption keys for different portions of a stream of data. It is alleged in the Office Action that time stamps used in the Shamoon et al. system corresponds to the time limit information of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that time stamps used in the Shamoon et al. system merely to identify "the particular portion of the stream which is controlled" by a control message. That is, time stamps are used to indicate which control message to use at a particular time. (See paragraphs [0068] and [0079] of Shamoon et al., for example.)

More particularly, Shamoon et al. is understood to disclose the use of a time stamp 207 in a header for determining when each object is supposed to be rendered, in order to synchronize various streams. In other words, the Shamoon et al. system determines the timing of rendering an object based on its time stamp.

Nothing has been found in Shamoon et al. that is believed to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes extraction means for extracting, from management information included in a bitstream, "time limit information which pertains to a time limit set for each of the plurality of object data, wherein the time limit information includes information of a period in which reproduction is permitted," and control means for "controlling a reproduction process set for each of the plurality of object data based on the time limit information," as recited in Claim 1.

As understood by Applicant, the Shamoon et al. system "extracts the content id and original mime type from Media Properties Header 1402." (See paragraphs [0201] to [0205].) It is respectfully submitted that this does not correspond to nor does it suggest the extraction of time limit information pertaining to a time limit set for each of a plurality of object data, as claimed in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Shamoon et al. and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent Claims 14, 27, and 28 each include a feature similar to that discussed above, in which an extracted time limit information is used control reproduction of object data. Therefore, those claims also are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Additionally, the other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of

the independent claims discussed above, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. However, because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for the this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 524341v1

Washington, D.C. 20231 Atty. Docket
Sir. Kindly acknowledge receipt of the accompanying:
Response to Official Action.
Check for \$ (claims fee)
□ Petition under 37 CFR 1.136 and Check for \$
Notice of Appeal and Check for \$
Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 and
Claim for priority and certified copies ofpriority applications
Type fee transmittel and Check for \$
Cher (specify) Copy of Lorens Office Action Dated
by placing your receiving date stamp horoon and returning to deliverer.

	` ,	
. FCHS-8-45	Mail Stop: AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents Date 06, 17,05	
	P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Atty. Docker 2012-0-215	78
	Sir: Application No. 1832.98 Kindly acknowledge receipt of the accompanying:	ii ii
	Check for \$ (claims fee) Petition under 37 CFR 1.136 and Check for \$	
	□ Notice of Appeal and Check for \$	
	Issue fee transmittal and Check for \$	
	Atty, LSVI Ag Due Date N D / D 37 CFR 1.8 BL 37 CFR 1.10 D By Hand D	:

	Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Application 12 Dil 832 981
FCHS-B 400	Kindly acknowledge receipt of the accompanying: Response to Official Action. Claims fee) JUN 2 0 2005 Check for \$ Claims fee) Department of Appeal and Check for \$ TRADEMIC Claim for priority and certified copies of Priority applications Issue fee transmittal and Check for \$ Priority applications Trademic Check for \$ Priority Check for \$